

REMARKS

This Amendment is being filed simultaneously with a Request for Continued Examination (RCE). This Amendment serves as a Submission under 37 C.F.R. §1.114.

Claims 22-25, 28 and 33-34 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 22, 28 and 33 are amended for clarity and claims 26-27 and 29 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the courtesies extended by Examiner Jasmine Stockely-Collins and Supervisory Examiner Andrew Koenig during the telephonic interview on January 25, 2011 with applicant's representative, Mr. Oren. The substance of the interview is incorporated in the following remarks.

The Office Action objects to claim 22 because of informalities. It is respectfully submitted that the above amendment obviates the grounds for objection. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 22-29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent 6,738,980 to Lin et al. (hereafter Lin) in view of U.S. Patent 6,104,441 to Wee et al. (hereafter Wee) and WO 03/028293 to Aksu et al. (hereafter Aksu). The Office Action also rejects claims 33-34 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Lin in view of Wee and Aksu. The rejections are respectfully traversed with respect to the pending claims.

Independent claim 22 recites receiving, by a transmitting server, information of a specific random access point from a remote unit, the specific random access point being input by a user

Reply to Office Action dated September 28, 2010

at the remote unit, and searching for the specific random access point in a content file stored in the transmitting server in response to the transmitting server receiving the information of the specific random access point input by the user of the remote unit. Independent claim 22 also recites reconfiguring a data stream based on a screen type of the specific random access point input by the user and a coincidence between the specific random access point and a data transmission starting point. Independent claim 22 also recites that reconfiguring the data stream comprises: determining an existing I-frame that is most similar to the specific random access point when the specific random access point is determined to be a P-frame and is the data transmission starting point, converting the P-frame into a new I-frame based on values of the existing I-frame and a next P-frame, wherein the converting is performed until the next P-frame is the specific random access point, configuring a media data sample based on the new I-frame as the data transmission starting point, configuring a new data stream using the media data sample and continuous media data samples, and converting a segment header of the media data sample having the new I-frame into a representative header in addition to a header of the new I-frame. Independent claim 22 also recites transmitting the new data stream including the converted representative header from the transmitting server to the remote unit.

The applied references do not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 22. More specifically, during the telephonic interview, applicant asserted that the applied references do not teach or suggest converting the P-frame into a new I-frame based on values of the existing I-frame and a next P-frame, configuring a media data sample based on the new I-frame

Reply to Office Action dated September 28, 2010

as the data transmission starting point, configuring a new data stream using the media data sample and continuous media data samples, and converting a segment header of the media data sample having the new I-frame into a representative header in addition to a header of the new I-frame, as recited in independent claim 22.

More specifically, the Office Action (on pages 5-6) states that Lin does not disclose features relating to converting the P-frame into a new I-frame and changing the header information of the new data stream. The Office Action cites Wee's FIG. 6 as allegedly disclosing these features, but admits that Wee does not disclose changing the header. The Office Action then states that Aksu teaches the features relating to changing header information. Applicant respectfully submits that the applied references, as a whole, do not teach or suggest the converting of a segment header of the media data sample having the new I-frame into a representative header in addition to the header of the new I-frame, as recited in independent claim 22. That is, Lin does not teach or suggest the claimed converting and Wee does not teach or suggest features relating to converting the header. Aksu also does not relate to a segment header of a media sample having a new I-frame. It is respectfully submitted that the combination, as a whole, does not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 22.

The applied references, as a whole, do not teach or suggest the converting of a P-frame into a new I-frame as well as the claimed configuring a media sample on the new data stream and the converting of the segment header of the media data sample having the new I-frame into a

Reply to Office Action dated September 28, 2010

representative header (in addition to a header of the new I-frame). These issues were discussed during the telephonic interview.

The Office Action also cites Lin's col. 7, line 65-col. 8, line 6 and col. 3, lines 58-62 for features relating to the claimed specific random access point. The Office Action asserts that a requested frame qualifies as a specific random access point, and that the specific access point is input by a user at a remote unit. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Lin does not teach or suggest features relating to a specific random access point being input by a user at a remote unit. In at least one non-limiting example, the present specification allows a file to be transmitted from a specific access point requested by a user.

Lin discloses VCR functions such as forward, backward, stop, fast-forward, fast-backward and random access. See col. 1, lines 27-35. The sections of Lin cited in the Office Action merely relate to entering into a random access with no suggestion for a specific random access point being input by a user of a remote unit. The cited section of col. 7, line 65-col. 8, line 6 states that when a client 102 requests remote-access play, the VCR managing module 107 of the server 101 controls bit-stream managing module 106 of the server 101 to select a reference frame. See also col. 3, lines 56-67.

Lin does not suggest receiving, by a transmitting server, information of a specific random access point from a remote unit, the specific random access point being input by a user at the remote unit, and searching for the specific random access point in a content file stored in the transmitting server in response to the transmitting server receiving the information of the

Reply to Office Action dated September 28, 2010

specific random access point input by the user at the remote unit, as recited in independent claim 22. Lin does not suggest a specific random access point being input by a user. Lin merely teaches requesting remote-access play. Further, Lin teaches that the server 101 selects a reference frame.

For at least these reasons, Lin does not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 22. Wee and Aksu also do not teach or suggest the missing features of independent claim 22. Thus, independent claim 22 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 33 recites receiving information of a specific random access point that was input by a user, determining a P-frame associated with the specific random access point input by the user, and determining an I-frame that is most similar to the determined P-frame. Independent claim 33 also recites converting a next P-frame that is adjacent to the determined I-frame into a new I-frame based on information of the next P-frame and the I-frame, configuring a media data sample by setting the converted new I-frame as a data transmission starting point after the converting into the new I-frame, converting a segment header of the configured media data sample having the converted new I-frame into a representative header which is other than a header of the converted new I-frame. Independent claim 33 also recites transmitting a data stream having the converted header and the configured media data samples.

For at least similar reasons, the applied references do not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 33. More specifically, Lin, Wee and Aksu do not teach or suggest converting a next P-frame that is adjacent to the determined I-frame into a new I-frame based on information of the next P-frame and the I-frame, configuring a media data sample by setting

the converted new I-frame as a data transmission starting point after the converting into the new I-frame, converting a segment header of the configured media data sample having the converted new I-frame into a representative header which is other than a header of the converted new I-frame, as recited in independent claim 33. Lin, Wee and Aksu also do not teach or suggest receiving information of a specific random access point that was input by a user, and determining a P-frame associated with the specific random access point input by the user, as recited in independent claim 33. Thus, independent claim 33 defines patentable subject matter.

For at least the reasons set forth above, each of independent claims 22 and 33 defines patentable subject matter. Each of the dependent claims depends from one of the independent claims and therefore defines patentable subject matter at least for this reason. In addition, the dependent claims recite features that further and independently distinguish over the applied references.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of claims 22-25, 28 and 33-34 are earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this,

Serial No. **10/678,068**

Docket No. **P-0557**

Reply to Office Action dated September 28, 2010

concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and
please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP


David C. Oren
Registration No. 38,694

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3777 DCO/kah

Date: January 28, 2011

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610